REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-10 and 13 are presented for consideration, with Claims 1, 9, 10 and 13 being independent.

Editorial changes have been made to the specification and abstract. In the claims, independent Claims 1, 9 and 10 have been amended to further distinguish Applicants' invention from the cited art. Additionally, editorial changes have been made to selected claims. Claim 13 has been added to provide an additional scope of protection. Claims 5 and 11 have been cancelled.

Initially, Claims 1-8 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Particular attention was paid to the grounds for this rejection as set forth on page 2 of the Office Action in amending Claims 1, 5, 7 and 12. Thus, the amendments are submitted to overcome this rejection, and it is submitted that all the claims pending in the application are in compliance with the particularly and distinctness requirements of the statute. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Kuo '270. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 of Applicants' invention relates to an image display apparatus comprised of a plurality of display devices, a plurality of scan interconnections and a plurality of modulation interconnections, which configures a matrix interconnection for driving the plurality of display devices, and a scanning circuit for outputting scanning signals sequentially with scanning the plurality of scan interconnections. In addition, a control circuit controls the scanning circuit in accordance with one scanning condition out of a plurality of scanning conditions which are different from each other, as to the number of scan interconnections which are selected simultaneously in each select period, or the number of scan interconnections to which the scanning signals are applied repeatedly in successive two select periods, or both of the number of the scan interconnections which are selected simultaneously in each select period and the number of scan interconnections to which the scanning signals are applied repeatedly in successive two select periods, and a modulation circuit applies a modulation signal to the modulation interconnection. As amended, the control circuit displays an insubstantial screen after displaying a screen under one scanning condition and before displaying a screen under another scanning condition and carries out change of the scanning condition while the insubstantial screen is displayed, with the insubstantial screen being a screen with information from a signal source which is disposed in the image display apparatus.

Support for the amendments to Claim 9 can be found, for example, on page 49, line 13, *et. seq.*, of the specification.

The Kuo patent relates to a method for scanning a thin film transistor liquid crystal display by scanning multiple rows of the display simultaneously. Kuo includes a display device, a plurality of scanning and data lines, and a scanning circuit . Figures 5-7 illustrate interlaced and progressive scanning modes.

In contrast to Claim 9, however, Kuo does not teach or suggest, among other features, a control circuit that displays an insubstantial screen after displaying a screen under one scanning condition and before displaying the screen under another scanning condition and carries out change of the scanning condition while the insubstantial screen is displayed, with the insubstantial screen being a screen with information from a signal source which is disposed in the image display apparatus.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being obvious over Kuo in view of Aratani '872. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In Claim 10, a display apparatus includes display devices, a plurality of scan and modulation interconnections and a modulation circuit as set forth in Claim 9. In addition, a scanning circuit outputs scanning signals sequentially with scanning the plurality of scan interconnections, and a control circuit controls the scanning circuit in accordance with one scanning condition out of a plurality of scanning conditions which are different from each other, as to the number of scan interconnections which are selected simultaneously in each select period, or the number of scan interconnections to which the scanning signals are applied repeatedly in successive two select periods, or both the number of the scan interconnections which are selected simultaneously in each select period and the number of the scan interconnections to which the scanning signals are applied repeatedly in successive two select periods. In addition, Claim 10 also provides a plurality of signal input terminals to which signals are inputted. As amended, the control circuit controls the scanning circuit by a scanning condition, which responded to the signal input terminal from which video signals to be displayed are inputted, which was selected out of a plurality of scanning conditions. Support for the amendments to Claim 10 can be found, for example, on page 30, line 23, *et. seq.*, of the specification.

As acknowledged in the Office Action, the Kuo patent does not disclose a control circuit changing the scanning conditions based on the input signal from a signal input terminal. The secondary citation to Aratani was cited to compensate for this deficiency. In Aratani, a display control method is provided with interlaced and non-interlaced scanning. The Office Action asserts that the control circuit changes scanning conditions based on an input signal from a signal input terminal. In contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, however, Aratani is not understood to teach or suggest, among other features, controlling a scanning circuit by a scanning condition, which responded to the signal input terminal from which video signals to be displayed are inputted. In Aratani, as understood, scanning conditions are changed based on an input signal from a mouse, but not a video signal. Accordingly, the proposed combination of Kuo and Aratani, even if proper, still fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claimed invention Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being obvious over Kobayashi in view of Sato '026. Without conceding the propriety of this rejection, Claim 11 has been cancelled. This rejection is therefore deemed to be moot and should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 5, 6 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being obvious over Kobayashi (EP '079) in view of Yamazaki. In addition, the remaining dependent claims are rejected as allegedly being obvious over those citations and further in view of Kuo (Claims 2 and 3), Kuo and Aratani (Claim 4), or Someya '796 (Claims 7 and 8). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 of Applicants' invention relates to an image display apparatus comprised of display devices, a plurality of scan and modulation interconnections, a scanning circuit for applying a scanning signal to the scan interconnections, and a modulation circuit for applying a modulation signal to the modulation interconnections. The scanning circuit applies the scanning signals to a group of scan interconnections selected from the plurality of scan interconnections in one select period, and applies the scanning signals, in a subsequent select period, to the plurality of scanning interconnections which were shifted with one scan interconnection portion from the group of scanning interconnections to which the scanning signals were applied in a previous select period, and applies the scanning signals which have the same polarity to the modulation signal in successive two select periods, to the scanning interconnection to which the scanning signals should be applied repeatedly. As amended, the output from the scanning circuit has a portion in which signal level is controlled to a non-selection electric potential level between the scanning signals which are applied repeatedly to the scanning interconnection, and the scanning circuit is configured to apply scanning signals with different electric potentials to a plurality of scan interconnections which are selected in one select period. As appreciated, Claim 1 has been amended to include a feature previously set forth in Claim 5, which has been cancelled. Further, support for the amendments to Claim 1 can be found, for example, on page 43, lines 13-22 of the specification.

The primary citation to Kobayashi relates to an optical modulation device that includes display devices, a plurality of scan lines and modulation lines, a scanning circuit and a modulation circuit. Figures 3 and 5 of Kobayashi are relied upon in the Office Action for teaching a scanning circuit that applies scanning signals to the scanning lines.

The secondary citation to Yamazaki relates to an electrooptical device and is relied upon for teaching an output signal of the scanning circuit having a low level signal.

In contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, however, the proposed combination of art, even if proper, still fails to teach or suggest, among other features, applying scanning signals with different electric potentials to a plurality of scan interconnections which are selected in one select period. In discussing Claim 5, the Office Action asserts that Figure 3 of Kobayashi teaches applying scanning signals with different potentials to a plurality of scanning lines which are selected in one select period. As read, however, Figure 3 of Kobayashi shows scanning signals selected in one select period (understood to be represented as T_n, T_{n+1}, T_{n+2}...) as having the same potentials. See, for example, the potentials of scanning signals n+1 and n+2 at selection period T_n+1.

Accordingly, the proposed combination of Kobayashi and Yamazaki, even if proper, still fails to teach or suggest Applicants' invention as set forth in Claim 1. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1, 5, 6 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

The tertiary citations to Kuo, Aratani and Someya '796 fail to compensate for the deficiencies in Kobayashi and Yamazaki as discussed above with respect to Claim 1.

Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections applied to Claims 2-4, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103 are also respectfully requested.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Applicants' invention as set forth in independent Claims 1, 9 and 10 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 2, 3 and 6-8 set forth additional features of Applicants' invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

New Claim 13 is also submitted to be patentable over the cited art. In Claim 13, an image display apparatus includes display devices, a plurality of scan and modulation interconnections, a scanning circuit, and a modulation circuit. As claimed, the scanning circuit applies scanning signals to a group of scan interconnections selected from the plurality of scan interconnections in one select period and applies the scanning signals, in a subsequent select period, to the plurality of scanning interconnections which were shifted with one scan interconnection portion from the group of scanning interconnections to which the scanning signals were applied in a previous select period, and applies the scanning signals which have the same polarity to the modulation signal in successive two select periods, to the scanning interconnection to which the scanning signals should be applied repeatedly. In addition, the scanning circuit is configured to apply scanning signals with different electric potentials to a plurality of scan interconnections which are selected in one selected period.

Support for Claim 13 can be found, for example, on page 30, line 24, of the specification.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Malpede/

Scott D. Malpede
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SDM\rnm

DC_MAIN 257717v1